

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- March 23, 1966

Appeal No. 8636 Karl F. and Sigrid Olsen, appellants

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered by the Board at the meeting of March 30, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: May 6, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the side yard requirements of the R-1-B District to permit a two story rear addition to dwelling at 3726 Kanawha Street, N.W., lot 1, square 1873, be granted.

From the record and the evidence adduced at the public hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

1. Appellant's lot is improved with a two story brick dwelling.
2. Appellants' lot has a 60.63 foot frontage on Kanawha Street, a west line dimension of 85 feet, an east dimension of 90.61 feet, and a rear lot line on a public alley measuring 29.95 feet.
3. The existing dwelling was built between 1920 and 1925.
4. Appellant acquired the property on September 21, 1965.
5. Appellant proposes to erect a two story rear addition contiguous to the east property line. The proposed addition would be spaced from the west property line by a space which would vary from a maximum of 13 feet to a minimum of 8 inches.
6. Section 3305.1 of the Zoning Regulations provides that there be a minimum of 8 foot side yard in the R-1-B District.
7. There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.
8. The record contains one letter recommending that the appeal be granted.
9. The proposed addition will not cause the building to exceed the lot occupancy requirements of the R-1-B District.

OPINION:

The Board is of the opinion that appellant has proved a hardship within the provisions of the variance clause of the statute, and that a denial of the requested relief would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and undue hardship upon the owner.

The Board is also of the opinion that the relief requested can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zoning plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.